Case 1:23-cv-00462-HBK	Document 12	Eilod 10/27/22	Dago 1 of 2
Case 1 /3-CV-UU40/-HBK	DOCUMENT 17	FIRO TUIZITZS	Page Lorz

DEVIN TREVONE LAMAR III,

v.

Plaintiff,

SONN, TOON, T. LEWIS, and FRANCO,

Defendants.

--

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Case No. 1:23-cv-00462-HBK (PC)

ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFF'S RENEWED MOTION TO PROCEED *IN* FORMA PAUPERIS AND REASSESSING FULL FILING FEE

(Doc. No. 11)

Pending before the Court is Plaintiff's renewed motion to proceed *in forma pauperis* ("IFP") filed on October 25, 2023. (Doc. No. 11). Plaintiff, a former state prisoner, initiated this action while he was incarcerated. (Doc. No. 1). Although currently released, Plaintiff remains obligated to pay the full amount of the statutory filing fee. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(b)(1). As set forth in the Court's September 20, 2023 Order, the total amount that remains due towards the \$350.00 filing fee is \$350.00. (Doc. No. 9 at 3). Due to Plaintiff's release from custody, there is no inmate trust account from which periodic filing fees may be garnished and forwarded to the Court. Although the Ninth Circuit has yet to decide how a released prisoner who is obligated to "pay the full amount of a filing fee" under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(b)(1) may proceed IFP after he is released, "the Ninth Circuit [did note] 'even prior to the PLRA...district courts possessed authority under the non-PLRA-related provisions of § 1915 to require partial and/or installment payments." *Makoni v. Downs*, 2016 WL 7210403, at \*3 (S.D. Cal. Dec. 13, 2016) (quoting

## Case 1:23-cv-00462-HBK Document 12 Filed 10/27/23 Page 2 of 2

Putzer v. Attal, 2013 WL 4519351, at \*2 (D. Nev. Aug. 23, 2013)) (citing Olivares v. Marshall, 59 F.3d 109, 111 (9th Cir. 1995)).

Plaintiff's renewed motion to proceed IFP makes the showing required to proceed IFP, but consistent with the Prison Litigation Reform Act, Plaintiff remains obligated to pay the full \$350.00 statutory filing fee as set forth in 28 U.S.C. § 1915. Given Plaintiff's current financial situation, the Court will not assess a monthly installment payment at this time. However, Plaintiff remains responsible for the full \$350.00 filing fee and will be required to notify the Court as soon as his financial situation changes.

## Accordingly, it is **ORDERED**:

- 1. Plaintiff's renewed motion to proceed *in forma pauperis*, (Doc. No. 11) is GRANTED and the Court assesses the full \$350.00 filing fee due to Plaintiff's former prisoner status.
- 2. Plaintiff shall notify the Court within thirty (30) days of any change in his current financial situation, i.e., if Plaintiff secures employment or is deemed eligible to receive any form of federal or *additional* <sup>1</sup>state financial assistance.
- 3. Plaintiff's failure to timely notify the Court of a change in his financial circumstances will result in the undersigned recommending the district court dismiss this action.

Dated: October 27, 2023

HELENA M. BARCH-KUCHTA

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>11</sup> The current assistance appears to cover only Plaintiff's basic necessitates.